

Remarks

The various parts of the Office Action (and other matters, if any) are discussed below under appropriate headings.

Allowable Subject Matter

The indicated allowability of claim 8 is noted with appreciation. Claim 8 has been amended into independent form and presumably is now allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-13, 15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ehrensvar et al. US 6,244,462 B1 (Ehrensvar).

Claim 1 has been amended. Consequently, the rejection under 35 USC 102 is now moot.

Claim 1 recites a blister package arrangement comprising a blister package including pockets for containing a tablet and a sealing film for sealing the pockets; and a conductor carrier connected to to the blister package. The conductor carrier has openings directed toward the pockets of the blister package. Upon removal of a tablet from a pocket, the sealing film of the blister package sealing the pocket must be separated, and the tablet is removable through a respective said opening. The openings are formed by stamped lines positioned within the conductor carrier that surround each of the pockets in a ring shape, and that are interrupted by at least two bridge parts by means of which a covering, separated by the stamped line out of the conductor carrier and covering the pocket, is connected with the conductor carrier. The bridge parts are so distributed at peripheral locations spaced apart about the periphery of the stamped line that, when a tablet is pressed out from a pocket, at least one of the bridge parts is broken. The conductor carrier includes plural circuits respectively associated with the openings, each circuit including an individual conductor that extends from an individual connecting pad and has bridge spanning portions extending over the bridge parts at said peripheral locations such that the bridge spanning portions of the individual conductor will be severed upon severing of the bridge parts at the respective peripheral locations. Of particular note is that severing of any one of the bridge spanning portions will break the respective circuit even when the bridge spanning portions at the other peripheral locations remain unbroken.

In Fig. 5 of Ehrensvard, a breakable gate 16 is connected by land portions 17 and 19 to a sheet on which a conductor is provided. The land portions are disposed at locations spaced about the periphery of the gate 16. A significant difference between Fig. 5 and the subject matter of amended claim 1 is that a conductor portion spanning a land portion at one location can be broken and yet the circuit will not be interrupted. That is, the conductor portions 17 or 19 on each side of the gate must both be broken to interrupt the circuit. Applicants recognized the possibility that a tablet could still be removed from the blister pack without severing both conductor portions on the same side of the gate. For instance, a tablet possibly could be removed by breaking only the bottom two or top two of the gates, in which case the circuit would not be interrupted and would not report removal of the tablet.

Moreover, Ehrensvard does not offer any solution to the problem nor do any of the other references cited by the Examiner. Rather, applicants have devised a simple and unique way to solve this problem as set forth in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehrensvard in view of Simon et al. US 2005/0226100 (Simon). As noted by the Examiner, "Ehrensvard does not specifically disclose an interface to provide an electrical connection between the conductor carrier and an attachable electronic unit configured to detect removal of a tablet from a pocket of the blister package, the interface comprising a plurality of individual connections pads and a common connection pad; a common conductor extending out from the common connection pad; and the individual conductors connecting to the common conductor."

The Examiner, however, contends "[i]t would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the arrangement of the common and individual pads connected together as taught by Simon, since Simon suggests at Para. 0034 and Fig. 4 that such a modification would provide an arrangement of the common and individual conductors to provide an electrical connection between the blister pack and an outside device." This is not correct when the references are considered in their entireties.

Ehrensvarð discloses a self-contained device including an integral electronics unit. The skilled person, seeking to improve upon the device disclosed in Ehrensvarð, would not in any way be motivated or otherwise prompted to look to Simon which discloses a device that can be plugged into an electronics unit. Note in particular column 3, lines 50-52 of Ehrensvarð which states "Thus, the electronic unit 50 must not be removed from the sheetlike envelope 10 to send information during a e.g. prevailing observation of a patient." With this in mind, claim 21 has been amended to make clear the interface provides for a removable connection.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, request is made for timely issuance of a notice of allowance.

The absence in this reply of any comments on any other contentions set forth in the Office Action should not be construed to be an acquiescence therein. Rather, no comment is needed since the rejections should be withdrawn for at least the foregoing reasons.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Don W. Bulson/

By _____
Don W. Bulson, Reg. No. 28,192

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

M:\LEL\KIP\0101\0101US-R01.doc